

Lawful Order and Moral Limits

Why Violent Resistance to Immigration Enforcement Cannot Be Justified Legally or Morally

A Concord Principle of Resistance (CPoR) Analysis

Jeff A. Pierson

Date of Authorship: July 2025

Document Designation: CPoR Brief No. 1: Sovereignty and Immigration

Jeff Pierson

Jeff Pierson

Disclaimer

This document is a moral, civic, and philosophical analysis based on the Concord Principle of Resistance (CPoR). It is intended to explore the ethical and constitutional boundaries of justified resistance in the context of immigration enforcement and related matters of sovereignty and trespass.

This document is **not legal advice**. It does not provide guidance on immigration law, legal defense, or individual cases. Readers are solely responsible for understanding and complying with the laws of their jurisdiction. No part of this work should be interpreted as encouragement to engage in unlawful behavior, violence, or defiance of legitimate authority.

The suffering of individuals and families impacted by deportation and removal is acknowledged with moral seriousness. However, this work affirms that hardship alone does not constitute moral innocence or justify the use of violent resistance. CPoR holds that all force must be restrained, justified, and lawful in nature, meeting the strict standards of Innocence, Imminence, Proportionality, Avoidance, and Reasonableness.

Preface

This document is not a political tract. It is not a legal manual. It is not a sermon. It is a principled inquiry into a difficult question that sits at the crossroads of law, ethics, sovereignty, and moral responsibility:

When, if ever, is violence justified in response to immigration enforcement?

What follows is a rigorous application of the Concord Principle of Resistance (CPoR), a framework developed not to encourage civil unrest but to constrain it. CPoR is built on five unyielding standards: Innocence, Imminence, Proportionality, Avoidance, and Reasonableness. These standards are drawn from natural rights theory, legal tradition, and moral theology. They are not political slogans. They are moral tests.

This document breaks new ground in several ways. It treats trespass not only as a legal violation but as a moral and ethical form of coercion. It draws a principled connection between private boundaries and national sovereignty, between property rights and immigration law, without lapsing into partisanship or cultural panic. It defends the humanity of immigrants while preserving the sanctity of consent and rule of law. It also confronts the modern misuse of compassion, too often invoked as license for disorder, with a deeper argument: that mercy without order is not justice, but sentiment weaponized.

The moral and theological sections are not window dressing. Scripture is examined seriously, not selectively. The Bible's witness on boundaries, consent, and moral restraint is applied with care, not force. Jesus is not portrayed as a political radical, but as a model of principled mercy, a man who upheld both truth and grace and who never sacrificed justice on the altar of emotional appeal.

This work may not please the ideologue, the partisan, or the populist. It was not written for them. It was written for the citizen who wants to preserve liberty without succumbing to anarchy, and for the neighbor who seeks justice without abandoning peace. It is a work of conscience.

The ideas expressed here are not inherited. They are built. They do not parrot talking points. They interrogate first principles. If they provoke disagreement, let that disagreement rise to the level of principle. If they challenge popular opinion, let that opinion be tested.

Liberty must be defended but never distorted. That is the purpose of this work.

Jeff A. Pierson

July 2025

Jeff Pierson

Contents

Preface.....	4
Introduction.....	7
Trespass as Violence: Legal, Ethical, and Moral Grounds for Defining Intrusion as Aggression	8
Legal Principle: Trespass and the Right to Exclude	8
Ethical Principle: Autonomy and Non-Coercion	8
Moral Principle: Natural Rights and the Integrity of Property	8
Applications of Principle to Common Scenarios.....	10
Home Invasion	10
Squatting	10
Guests Who Refuse to Leave.....	10
Neighbors Who Ignore Property Boundaries	11
Application to Immigration and Visa Violations	13
Illegal Immigration as Trespass	13
Visa Overstays as Ethical Coercion	13
National Sovereignty as a Moral Right.....	13
Conclusion: Immigration Without Consent Is Civic Trespass.....	14
Why CPoR Cannot Justify Violent Resistance in Defense of Illegal Immigration.....	15
Introduction	15
1. Innocence	15
2. Imminence	15
3. Proportionality.....	15
4. Avoidance	16
5. Reasonableness	16
Conclusion	16
Biblical Ethics of Boundaries, Consent, and Sovereignty	17
Property Boundaries Are Sacred.....	17
Consent and Ethical Autonomy.....	17
Nations Have Moral Boundaries.....	17
Jesus Defended Justice Without Abandoning Compassion.....	18
Conclusion: A Biblical Framework for CPoR	18
Appendix: Counterpoint-Response.....	19

1. Consent Cannot Be Absolute in a Fallen World	19
2. Moral Innocence Is Too Narrow	19
3. Imminence Is Interpreted Too Literally	20
4. Scriptural Consent Theology Overreads the Text	20
5. The Defense of Borders Can Be Ethically Compromised by Political Motive.....	21
Conclusion	22
References	23
Glossary of Terms and Related Concepts.....	24

Introduction

The question of how a nation handles immigration and removal is not merely a policy matter. It is a human matter. Deportation, even when carried out lawfully, often involves real suffering. Families are separated. Children are uprooted. Lives built over years may be abruptly disrupted. Those facing removal are frequently poor, fearful, and vulnerable. In many cases, they are fleeing violence, poverty, or political dysfunction. For observers, particularly those motivated by compassion or cultural solidarity, these events can feel unjust, even cruel.

The Concord Principle of Resistance does not ignore these realities. It acknowledges that enforcement of immigration law, like any exercise of state power, can produce moral conflict and emotional pain. However, pain alone is not the measure of justice. Sympathy, while powerful, does not override moral standards. To justify violent resistance, especially against lawful authority, the act must meet a rigorous test.

CPoR offers that test. It holds that violent defensive resistance is only justified when five strict moral and legal conditions are satisfied: Innocence, Imminence, Proportionality, Avoidance, and Reasonableness. These are not subjective preferences. They are standards rooted in natural law, legal precedent, and historical examples of legitimate resistance. They are designed to prevent chaos, ideology, or personal grievance from becoming a license for violence.

When applied to cases involving illegal immigration or visa overstays, these standards are not met. Those facing removal have, by definition, entered or remained in the country without legal permission. While this does not erase their humanity, it does mean they are not innocent in the legal or civic sense. The threat they face is administrative and legal, not immediate and lethal. Protests or attacks against immigration authorities are not proportionate to the threat involved. Legal alternatives, including appeals, asylum petitions, and policy advocacy, remain available. And the broader public, while often sympathetic, does not consider violence a reasonable or restrained response to deportation.

Therefore, the Concord Principle of Resistance cannot justify the use of violent defensive force by illegal immigrants or on their behalf. The moral weight of suffering must be honored, but it does not erase the moral boundaries of justice. Where lawful remedies remain and peaceful change is possible, violence becomes not resistance but rebellion against order. CPoR exists to prevent such confusion and to preserve liberty through moral clarity, not emotional reaction.

Trespass as Violence: Legal, Ethical, and Moral Grounds for Defining Intrusion as Aggression

Violence is not always loud. It does not always come with fists, weapons, or blood. Sometimes, violence enters quietly through a door uninvited, but no less coercively. In the traditions of law, ethics, and natural rights, unauthorized entry onto another person's property is not a neutral act. It is a violation. Even without physical harm, such an act can rightly be classified as violent because it defies consent, erodes autonomy, and imposes will through presence rather than lawful authority.

Legal Principle: Trespass and the Right to Exclude

The legal principle at stake is the right to exclusive possession. This refers to the lawful authority to determine who may enter, remain, or be removed from one's property. Trespass is defined in law as the intentional and unauthorized entry onto the land of another. It is recognized as a tort, or civil wrong, and in many contexts also as a criminal offense, even if no damage occurs.

The reason is clear. Legal reasoning acknowledges that violence includes coercive violations of liberty or security, not just physical injury. A trespasser imposes their presence in defiance of the owner's will, nullifying consent and undermining the owner's control. This constitutes constructive violence, a legal term used to describe non-physical actions that produce real harm. The trespasser displaces the rightful legal authority of the owner and replaces it with unlawful occupation. In this context, the law treats trespass not as a mere inconvenience, but as an aggressive denial of sovereign control over one's space (Prosser, 1971).

Ethical Principle: Autonomy and Non-Coercion

The ethical principle involved is autonomy. Autonomy is the moral right of individuals to govern themselves, manage their space, and be free from unwanted interference. In an ethical framework, violence is understood as any act that removes or overrides another person's ability to make free choices within their rightful domain.

Trespass violates this standard by introducing a coercive presence. A person who remains in your space without permission asserts control over a place they have no right to occupy. Even if the act appears non-threatening, it is ethically aggressive. It denies the owner's right to decide who may be present and when. Coercion, defined as the imposition of will without consent, is a form of ethical violence. It may not leave bruises, but it violates self-rule and moral dignity (Nozick, 1974).

Moral Principle: Natural Rights and the Integrity of Property

The moral framework governing trespass is grounded in natural rights theory, particularly as articulated by John Locke and affirmed by the American Founders. Life, liberty, and property are not separate privileges. They are a single moral inheritance. According to Locke, "every man has a property in his own person," and the fruits of one's labor become an extension of that personhood (Locke, 1689/1988, §27).

In this view, property is not just a legal possession. It is a moral extension of the self. To enter it without permission is not simply to cross a line on a map, but to violate the liberty of the person to

whom it belongs. Consent is the foundation of moral legitimacy. When that consent is ignored, the act becomes aggressive. The violation may be quiet, and the damage may be invisible, but the moral principle is unchanged. To intrude without consent is to deny the equal dignity and rightful dominion of the owner.

Having defined trespass as a moral, legal, and ethical form of coercion, we now turn to practical situations where these principles are most often tested. Whether the intrusion is sudden or sustained, intentional or neglectful, the same standard applies: the act becomes violent when it overrides rightful authority without consent.

Applications of Principle to Common Scenarios

Home Invasion

Legal

A home invasion is the unlawful and often forceful entry into an occupied dwelling. It is considered the most extreme form of trespass and is typically prosecuted as a felony. It violates the right to exclusive possession and is presumed to be coercive and dangerous. This is why lethal self-defense is often legally justified in response.

Ethical

Home invasion eliminates the resident's autonomy. The intruder strips the owner of their ability to control who enters their home, when, and under what terms. The violation is not merely physical; it is existential. It sends the message that the victim is no longer sovereign in their own space.

Moral

According to Locke's theory of natural rights, the home is an extension of the self. To violate that space is to violate liberty. Defensive force in this situation is morally justifiable because it restores the natural order of liberty and property rather than disrupting it.

Squatting

Legal

Squatting refers to occupying property without legal title or the owner's consent. Even when done without violence, it constitutes civil trespass and is often considered criminal once notice is given. While some jurisdictions provide remedies under adverse possession laws, these are legal technicalities and do not confer moral justification.

Ethical

Squatting is coercion by persistence. Regardless of the squatter's motives or personal hardship, it imposes will without consent. Ethical autonomy is compromised when one person occupies and controls another's property without permission, even passively.

Moral

Locke argued that property ownership arises from labor and voluntary agreement. Squatting circumvents both of these moral requirements. It is not an act of resistance to injustice; it is a form of stagnant appropriation, and morally it is equivalent to theft.

Guests Who Refuse to Leave

Legal

A guest who remains after being asked to leave transitions from lawful visitor to trespasser. While their initial presence was permitted, their continued presence without consent is unlawful and reclassified as intrusion under the law.

Ethical

Refusing to leave after consent is withdrawn is a form of soft coercion. It exploits social norms to override the autonomy of the host. Ethical boundaries are breached when personal space is occupied against the express will of the property owner.

Moral

Hospitality is a temporary agreement, not a permanent entitlement. Consent must remain active. A guest who stays after being asked to leave assumes authority that does not belong to them. This violates the moral dignity and liberty of the host.

Neighbors Who Ignore Property Boundaries

Legal

Encroachments such as building fences over boundary lines or repeatedly entering another's land can qualify as civil trespass or nuisance. Even seemingly minor intrusions may become grounds for legal action. The law affirms that all property rights include the right to exclude others entirely.

Ethical

Disregarding property boundaries demonstrates entitled negligence. Ethical relationships between neighbors are based on mutual respect, which requires seeking consent, not making assumptions or ignoring established limits.

Moral

Property lines serve as moral boundaries as much as physical ones. Crossing them without permission diminishes the rightful authority and dignity of the property holder. Repeated violations do not merely cause annoyance; they escalate into systemic moral aggression.

Conclusion: Violence Without Bruises

True violence is not limited to physical harm. It includes any act that forcibly violates the boundaries of another person. Trespass, in all its forms, is a coercive act. It imposes presence without consent, overrides lawful authority, and substitutes intrusion for justice. Though it may involve no weapons or shouting, it communicates domination. It tells the rightful owner, your control ends here, and mine begins. Under legal, ethical, and moral principles, trespass is more than a disturbance. It is a form of violence against liberty itself.

Summary

In each of the four scenarios—home invasion, squatting, guests who refuse to leave, and neighbors who cross boundaries—unauthorized presence is not merely inappropriate. It is coercive. It disregards legal rights, ethical autonomy, and moral personhood. Whether subtle or overt,

temporary or ongoing, trespass asserts control without consent. In a society built on liberty, that is never a trivial matter. It is a warning sign that the foundations of freedom are being quietly eroded.

These private scenarios—home invasion, squatting, lingering guests, and boundary-ignoring neighbors—demonstrate that unauthorized presence, even when nonviolent, undermines justice and liberty. The question then becomes whether the same logic applies to public and national boundaries. When a person enters or remains in a nation without lawful consent, is it not also a form of coercive presence? To answer this, we now apply these principles to immigration and visa enforcement.

Application to Immigration and Visa Violations

The principles of legal sovereignty, ethical autonomy, and natural rights apply not only to personal property but also to the integrity of national borders. Just as entering a home without permission or remaining after consent is revoked constitutes trespass, so too does unlawful presence within a country violate the foundational principles of ordered liberty. National borders are not abstract; they are legal and moral boundaries of collective governance.

Illegal Immigration as Trespass

Entering a sovereign nation without permission is legally analogous to unlawful entry onto private property. It denies the host government's authority to regulate access, evaluate risk, and define the terms under which entry may occur. In legal terms, this is national-level trespass. It is an uninvited act that bypasses law, process, and the consent of the governed.

Although such entry may be nonviolent in the conventional sense, it is coercive in structure. It asserts presence without permission and imposes individual will upon the host society. This presence is not neutral; it is a rejection of lawful boundaries and a disruption of the legal order intended to protect collective rights.

Visa Overstays as Ethical Coercion

Overstaying a visa is ethically equivalent to a guest who refuses to leave after their invitation has expired. The host's original consent was limited and conditional. Continued presence after that consent is withdrawn becomes a form of ethical coercion, regardless of intent or demeanor.

This act substitutes lawful permission with personal presumption. It transforms temporary hospitality into permanent entitlement. Ethically, it undermines the autonomy of the host society. Just as a homeowner has the right to determine who may enter or remain in their space, a nation has the ethical authority to decide who may reside within its borders. Ignoring these limits displaces civic self-rule and erodes the shared authority of the political community.

National Sovereignty as a Moral Right

In the natural rights tradition, nations exist by the consent of the governed to protect life, liberty, and property. Borders are not arbitrary; they are moral boundaries that define civic identity, mutual responsibility, and lawful belonging. Unauthorized immigrants, however peaceful or sympathetic, bypass the moral process that binds citizens together under a common rule.

They receive the benefits of national membership—legal protection, public services, economic access—without submitting to the responsibilities, duties, or selection procedures that give those benefits moral legitimacy. This is not merely a policy violation. It is a moral intrusion, akin to squatting on land one does not own and cannot claim.

By disregarding consent and ignoring lawful order, the unauthorized presence treats the nation's moral authority as irrelevant. In Lockean terms, such presence is illegitimate because it rejects both the social contract and the moral consent that define lawful belonging.

Conclusion: Immigration Without Consent Is Civic Trespass

The same principles that justify personal property rights—exclusive possession, consent-based access, and moral dominion—also apply to national borders. A political community has the right to determine who may enter, for what purpose, and under what conditions. Immigration without authorization and overstaying a visa are not merely technical violations of bureaucratic process. They are acts of coercive presence that override collective consent.

In a society grounded in law and liberty, such presence is not simply unlawful. It is a principled form of trespass—one that undermines sovereignty, erodes ethical autonomy, and ignores the natural rights of a self-governing people.

If unlawful presence constitutes a moral violation of national boundaries, the next question is whether violent resistance in defense of that presence can ever be justified. The Concord Principle of Resistance provides a five-part standard for determining when such force is morally and civically legitimate. We now apply that framework to the question of immigration enforcement and removal.

Why CPoR Cannot Justify Violent Resistance in Defense of Illegal Immigration

Under the Concord Principle of Resistance (CPoR), it is nearly impossible to justify the use of violent defensive resistance either by illegal immigrants or on their behalf, because such situations almost always fail to meet the doctrine's five core moral-legal standards: Innocence, Imminence, Proportionality, Avoidance, and Reasonableness.

Introduction

According to the Concord Principle of Resistance (CPoR), violent defensive resistance is only justified when all five moral and legal standards are fully met: Innocence, Imminence, Proportionality, Avoidance, and Reasonableness. When applied to situations involving illegal immigration or visa overstays, these standards overwhelmingly rule out the legitimacy of violent resistance—either by individuals resisting deportation or by those acting on their behalf.

1. Innocence

The CPoR standard of Innocence requires that those using force must not be the aggressors. They must not have initiated, provoked, or escalated the situation in an unlawful way. Illegal immigrants, by definition, have entered or remained in a country without permission. This initial act breaks the host nation's legal framework and violates its sovereign right to determine entry. While the motives may vary, the legal and moral innocence required by CPoR is absent. Those who commit violence on behalf of illegal immigrants, such as attacking immigration officers or federal buildings, are not repelling unjust violence but initiating force to obstruct lawful processes. This fails the first threshold entirely.

2. Imminence

Imminence demands a real, immediate, and personal threat to life, liberty, or bodily integrity. Deportation proceedings or immigration enforcement actions, while serious, do not constitute an imminent threat of death or severe bodily harm. These are administrative and legal actions subject to appeal. Even where detention or removal leads to hardship, the threat is procedural, not violent. Fear of poverty, separation, or legal penalty does not meet the CPoR definition of an imminent threat. Violence in response to immigration enforcement lacks the urgency and directness that Imminence requires.

3. Proportionality

Proportionality means that the level of force used must match the severity of the threat. Lethal or violent resistance is only justified when a lethal or violent threat is present. Deportation, while impactful, does not rise to the level of aggression that justifies violent retaliation. Storming courthouses, attacking ICE facilities, or engaging in riots to oppose immigration enforcement are

not proportionate responses to administrative legal actions. These acts escalate rather than restrain, making them morally indefensible under CPoR's third standard.

4. Avoidance

Avoidance requires that all peaceful and lawful options be exhausted before resorting to force. In immigration cases, there are numerous avenues for legal redress, including asylum claims, appeals, attorney representation, and political advocacy. For supporters, legal protest, lobbying, and litigation remain fully available. Even where the law is seen as unjust, the system still offers lawful paths to challenge outcomes. Unless all of these remedies have been attempted and denied, any use of violence is premature and invalid under CPoR. Avoidance has not been satisfied.

5. Reasonableness

The Reasonableness standard considers whether an impartial and informed public would see the resistance as appropriate, restrained, and morally intelligible. While many people may sympathize with illegal immigrants, most would not view violent acts against immigration officers, court buildings, or government officials as reasonable. They would distinguish between lawful protest and unlawful aggression. A principled observer would conclude that these actions are ideological, not defensive. Reasonableness fails because the cause, however emotional, does not justify the method.

Conclusion

Under the Concord Principle of Resistance, the use of violent defensive resistance is held to the highest moral, legal, and civic standards. In cases involving illegal immigration or visa overstays, none of those standards are satisfied. The individuals are not legally or morally innocent. The threat is not imminent. The use of force is disproportionate. Legal alternatives remain available. And the broader public would not reasonably support violence as a justified response.

Therefore, CPoR does not and cannot justify violent resistance by illegal immigrants or on their behalf. To claim otherwise is to confuse moral sentiment with moral clarity, and to distort a doctrine built to preserve liberty, not excuse lawlessness.

While the moral and legal arguments are compelling on their own, many who wrestle with these issues also seek spiritual clarity. Does Scripture support the defense of boundaries, consent, and lawful order? Or does it call for the unconditional defense of the vulnerable, regardless of law? To address this, we now turn to the biblical foundations of sovereignty and moral resistance.

Jeff Pierson

Biblical Ethics of Boundaries, Consent, and Sovereignty

The principles of lawful possession, moral boundaries, and defensive authority are not modern constructs. They are rooted in biblical theology. Scripture affirms the sanctity of consent, the sacredness of property lines, the right to defend one's home or land, and the legitimacy of national identity and order. Trespass, whether physical or civic, is treated in Scripture as a violation of justice, not simply of custom but of divine order.

Property Boundaries Are Sacred

The Bible treats property boundaries not merely as economic designations but as spiritual and moral obligations. Boundary markers were considered sacred signs of God's order and inheritance. To remove them was an act of theft and rebellion.

"You shall not move your neighbor's landmark, which the men of old have set, in the inheritance that you will hold in the land that the Lord your God is giving you to possess" (Deuteronomy 19:14).

"Cursed is anyone who moves their neighbor's boundary stone. Then all the people shall say, 'Amen'" (Deuteronomy 27:17).

These laws reflect more than respect for private property. They express God's endorsement of ordered space. Boundary keeping was a way to uphold peace, justice, and stewardship. Violating these lines was not simply illegal. It was immoral.

Consent and Ethical Autonomy

Scripture places extraordinary moral weight on consent. God does not force relationship. From Eden to Revelation, divine interaction is framed by invitation, covenant, and freedom to accept or refuse. Jesus affirmed this ethic when He taught:

"Let what you say be simply 'Yes' or 'No'; anything more than this comes from evil" (Matthew 5:37).

"Behold, I stand at the door and knock. If anyone hears My voice and opens the door, I will come in to him and dine with him, and he with Me" (Revelation 3:20).

These passages show that God's order respects human agency. Coercion, even for noble goals, is incompatible with divine ethics. The Golden Rule reinforces this relational morality:

"Do to others as you would have them do to you" (Luke 6:31).

To enter, remain, or impose without consent, whether in a home, a nation, or a covenant, is to reject the moral dignity of the other. It is not neutral. It is domination.

Nations Have Moral Boundaries

The Bible affirms that nations are legitimate moral communities with defined borders and distinct responsibilities. In Acts 17:26, Paul declares:

“From one man He made all the nations, that they should inhabit the whole earth; and He marked out their appointed times in history and the boundaries of their lands.”

National distinctions and boundaries are not accidents of geography. They are part of God’s providential structure for human civilization. The moral right to regulate entry, citizenship, and communal life flows from this divinely established order.

This principle is illustrated in the regulation of access to sacred space. In Ezekiel 44:9, God declares:

“No foreigner, uncircumcised in heart and flesh, is to enter My sanctuary.”

This was not about ethnicity. It was about covenant alignment. Access to holy space required moral readiness and respect for the sanctity of place. Likewise, civil societies have the right to protect their communal integrity through lawful processes.

Jesus Defended Justice Without Abandoning Compassion

Jesus modeled the perfect balance of mercy and moral discipline. In John 8:11, after saving a woman from mob violence, He told her, “Neither do I condemn you; go and sin no more.” He protected her dignity, but He did not excuse her sin. His compassion was always tethered to truth.

In Mark 12:17, Jesus affirmed lawful civic responsibility when He said, “Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar’s, and to God the things that are God’s.” He did not call for revolt. He did not undermine order. His kingdom was not built on coercion but on voluntary obedience.

Jesus showed that compassion without structure is chaos, and order without compassion is tyranny. He defended the poor, the foreigner, and the outcast, but never at the expense of justice or truth.

Conclusion: A Biblical Framework for CPoR

The biblical witness affirms the moral architecture of the Concord Principle of Resistance. Property lines are sacred. Consent is ethically binding. Nations have a moral right to regulate their borders. Compassion is vital, but it must be governed by righteousness. Mercy flows from truth, not from lawlessness or coercion.

To enter a home, land, or nation without permission is not merely unlawful. It is unjust in the sight of God. To defend one's household, community, or country against coercive intrusion is not aggression. It is stewardship. Scripture speaks not only to the condition of the heart, but also to the boundaries and structures that preserve peace. The Concord Principle of Resistance is not a modern invention. It is a continuation of the moral clarity revealed through God’s Word.

Jeff Pierson

Appendix: Counterpoint-Response

1. Consent Cannot Be Absolute in a Fallen World

Counterpoint:

While your framework treats consent as the cornerstone of moral authority, real-world power imbalances often make genuine consent impossible. For example, an undocumented immigrant fleeing cartel violence may not be “consenting” to violate borders so much as escaping coercion. Similarly, national laws may reflect the will of the powerful more than the governed.

Challenge to CPoR:

Some argue that requiring free consent for all authority ignores the fact that many people are already living under unjust conditions where consent has been denied or distorted. From this view, resistance—even violent resistance—is not a violation of consent, but a response to domination that was already imposed.

Response:

CPoR does not deny the existence of unjust conditions, but it insists that moral response must still honor the principle of consent. Otherwise, we replace one form of coercion with another. If consent is not real or worth preserving, then neither is liberty. Those fleeing injustice deserve moral consideration, but no one has the right to impose their presence on others without lawful agreement. Exceptions for those facing persecution or humanitarian crises already exist in the form of asylum, refugee status, and other legal protections—when properly requested through the available channels. Redressing injustice must begin with persuasion, advocacy, and reform, not by replacing one denied consent with another.

2. Moral Innocence Is Too Narrow

Counterpoint:

Your CPoR standard of “Innocence” excludes all those who have technically broken a law, even if that law is unjust or inhumane. By this logic, freedom fighters, civil rights leaders, and Underground Railroad operators would all fail the “innocence” test at the moment of resistance.

Challenge to CPoR:

If moral innocence is tied too tightly to legality, the standard can inadvertently uphold tyranny where unjust laws are used to strip people of the very innocence they need to resist.

Response:

CPoR does not equate innocence with obedience to bad laws. It equates moral innocence with the absence of coercion or aggressive violation. The Underground Railroad did not resist neutral authority—it resisted the forced return of human beings to bondage. The abolitionist rescuers of 1858 were innocent in the moral sense because they used proportionate force to stop a gross

violation of natural rights. By contrast, those who resist lawful deportation after knowingly violating entry laws are not defending liberty—they are rejecting lawful order. U.S. law already provides humanitarian exceptions, including asylum, refugee status, and other protections for those fleeing credible persecution or danger.

The vast majority of illegal immigration, however, does not qualify under these exceptions and involves no lawful request for relief. It must also be emphasized that the Concord Principle of Resistance is focused specifically on the question of violent resistance, particularly when it is used to defy immigration enforcement or protect unlawful presence by force. Peaceful protests, legal advocacy, or appeals for reform fall outside the scope of this framework. CPoR applies specifically to cases where physical force is employed or advocated in response to government action. The standard of innocence exists to protect the truly oppressed while restraining opportunism and ideological coercion.

3. Imminence Is Interpreted Too Literally

Counterpoint:

CPoR's requirement that threats be "imminent" risks ignoring structural or long-term violence, such as poverty, racial profiling, or family separation. For many migrants, the violence is not immediate in form, but inevitable in consequence.

Challenge to CPoR:

This interpretation may unjustly favor physical over existential harm and could exclude morally urgent resistance simply because the threat is delayed, diffuse, or bureaucratic in nature.

Response:

CPoR defines imminence as a clear, personal, and direct threat to life, liberty, or bodily integrity. While systemic hardship and policy-driven suffering may be real and deserving of attention, they do not meet the standard of an immediate, coercive threat. To classify bureaucratic enforcement—such as deportation proceedings—as an imminent danger would erase the line between discomfort and aggression. The imminence standard exists to prevent preemptive or ideologically motivated violence masquerading as defense. Redefining harm to include all hardship risks moral collapse, where subjective fear replaces objective threat. CPoR upholds imminence not to downplay suffering, but to ensure that force is never used unless there is no other way to prevent direct and unjust harm.

4. Scriptural Consent Theology Overreads the Text

Counterpoint:

While Scripture clearly values free will, it also includes plenty of examples where God overrides consent: sending Jonah to Nineveh, striking down nations, or commanding Israel to take

Jeff Pierson

possession of Canaan. The covenant model often assumes hierarchy and command—not just mutual agreement.

Challenge to CPoR:

Basing civic ethics on an idealized view of divine consent risks flattening Scripture and ignoring its complexity. Critics could argue that consent is a pattern in Scripture, but not a doctrine, and not intended as the primary model for immigration ethics.

Response:

Scripture does show divine sovereignty, but that sovereignty never gives humans permission to override each other's will without moral cause. Consent is not the only theme in Scripture, but it is a consistent one, particularly in God's dealings with people. From Eden to Sinai to the New Covenant, God invites, warns, and respects human agency. Even when judgment is imposed, it is preceded by warning and refusal. Revelation 3:20, Deuteronomy's boundary laws, and Jesus' teaching on "let your yes be yes" all affirm that consent is a sacred ethical boundary. CPoR does not ignore divine command; it applies the biblical pattern of voluntary moral order to civil life.

5. The Defense of Borders Can Be Ethically Compromised by Political Motive

Counterpoint:

Even if national sovereignty is legitimate in theory, the motives and mechanisms of border enforcement are often politically compromised, tainted by racism, economic interest, or ideological hostility. Defending border enforcement morally, even conditionally, can appear to whitewash systemic injustice.

Challenge to CPoR:

By making enforcement the assumed moral default, critics might argue that your framework fails to account for the corruption of the enforcers, and risks legitimizing unjust policy under the banner of order.

Response:

Motives may be mixed, but laws are not judged solely by the intent of the enforcer. If we delegitimize law because some actors are corrupt, then we risk collapsing the entire idea of moral order. CPoR requires us to evaluate *the act itself*, not the emotion behind it. Just as unjust laws must be resisted with care, just laws must not be resisted merely because of emotional opposition or institutional imperfection. The proper response to unjust enforcement is legal challenge, reform, and exposure—not violent defiance of every border or process.

6. Compassion Should Be a Greater Moral Priority than Order

Counterpoint:

From a biblical standpoint, compassion is not sentimentalism, it is a divine command. The parable

of the Good Samaritan, Jesus's welcome to the outsider, and the ethic of enemy-love (Matthew 5) all suggest that order exists to serve mercy, not the other way around.

Challenge to CPoR:

Critics might say your framework gives order too much weight and sacrifices redemptive compassion on the altar of procedural justice—especially when applied to desperate migrants or undocumented families.

Response:

Jesus did not equate compassion with lawlessness. He wept for the suffering, but He never excused sin or chaos. His compassion was governed by truth. “Go and sin no more” was not coldness—it was redemptive order. CPoR agrees that compassion is essential—but compassion is most powerful when it does not trample justice. A society that abolishes boundaries in the name of love loses both justice and love. CPoR preserves the moral space for compassion within the limits of law and consent. That is how mercy becomes morally sustainable.

Conclusion

There are many forms of protest and resistance that may be morally or civically justified in response to deportation or immigration enforcement. Peaceful demonstrations, legal advocacy, political organizing, and public witness all fall within the bounds of legitimate dissent. However, violent defensive resistance, acts of aggression, and the destruction of property are not supported by the Concord Principle of Resistance—nor by any widely recognized moral or ethical framework. Violence may express outrage, but it does not establish justice. CPoR exists to protect liberty through principled restraint, not to license force in the absence of clear, lawful cause.

Jeff Pierson

References

Aquinas, T. (1947). *Summa Theologica* (Fathers of the English Dominican Province, Trans.). Benziger Bros. (Original work published 1274)

Branca, A. (2021). *The Law of Self Defense: Principles* (3rd ed.). Law of Self Defense Press.

Deuteronomy 19:14. (English Standard Version). (2001). Crossway Bibles.

Deuteronomy 27:17. (English Standard Version). (2001). Crossway Bibles.

Ezekiel 44:9. (English Standard Version). (2001). Crossway Bibles.

John 8:11. (English Standard Version). (2001). Crossway Bibles.

Japanese Relocation Cases: Korematsu v. United States, 323 U.S. 214 (1944).

Locke, J. (1988). *Two Treatises of Government* (P. Laslett, Ed.). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1689)

Luke 6:31. (English Standard Version). (2001). Crossway Bibles.

Mark 12:17. (English Standard Version). (2001). Crossway Bibles.

Matthew 5:37. (English Standard Version). (2001). Crossway Bibles.

Nozick, R. (1974). *Anarchy, State, and Utopia*. Basic Books.

Prosser, W. L. (1971). *Law of Torts* (4th ed.). West Publishing.

Revelation 3:20. (English Standard Version). (2001). Crossway Bibles.

United States v. Miller, 307 U.S. 174 (1939).

Acts 17:26. (English Standard Version). (2001). Crossway Bibles.

Glossary of Terms and Related Concepts

Adverse Possession

A legal doctrine that allows someone to gain ownership of land after continuous and open occupation without the owner's consent for a legally specified period. While it may create legal title, it does not provide moral justification under natural rights theory.

Aggression

The act of imposing force, control, or presence without consent. In this framework, aggression includes non-physical violations such as trespass, coercion, and boundary invasion.

Avoidance

One of the five core CPoR standards. It requires that all lawful and peaceful alternatives be exhausted before force is used. If nonviolent legal remedies remain, violent resistance is not morally justified.

Autonomy

The ethical principle that individuals have the right to self-governance and control over their own bodies, decisions, and spaces. Violations of autonomy are considered ethical violence.

Boundary Violation

An unauthorized crossing of personal or property lines—physical, legal, or moral. Boundary violations undermine the right to exclusive possession and respect for autonomy.

Coercion

The imposition of one's will on another without consent. In the context of trespass, coercion refers to the act of remaining on or entering property against the owner's wishes, regardless of the use of force.

Constructive Violence

Non-physical but coercive behavior that violates legal or moral rights, such as unlawful occupation or invasion of property. Recognized in law and ethics as a legitimate form of harm.

Consent

Voluntary agreement to allow someone into one's space or to engage in a relationship. Consent must be ongoing and revocable. Absence of consent converts lawful presence into trespass.

Civic Trespass

The unlawful or unauthorized presence in a political or communal space, particularly when imposed against the will of the governing community or sovereign authority.

CPoR (Concord Principle of Resistance)

A moral and civic doctrine that outlines when violent defensive resistance against governing

Jeff Pierson

authorities is justified. It requires five standards to be met: Innocence, Imminence, Proportionality, Avoidance, and Reasonableness.

Dominion

The rightful control or authority over a person, place, or thing. Trespass denies dominion by displacing the property owner's authority.

Encroachment

A form of boundary violation where a structure or repeated behavior crosses into another's property. Encroachments may be minor in scale but serious in principle.

Exclusive Possession

A legal right that allows a property owner to decide who may enter or remain on their land. Foundational to property law and upheld as a protective measure against trespass.

Home Invasion

An unlawful entry into an occupied residence, often forceful and always without consent. Legally and morally considered one of the most dangerous forms of trespass.

Hospitality

The act of welcoming someone into one's home or space. Ethically valid only while consent is maintained. Refusal to leave after consent is revoked becomes coercive.

Imminence

One of the five CPoR standards. A threat must be immediate and direct, not hypothetical or anticipated. Resistance is not justified against distant or procedural harm.

Innocence

A CPoR requirement that the individual using force must not be the aggressor or provocateur. Resistance is only legitimate if the individual did not unlawfully escalate the situation.

Intrusion

The act of entering or remaining on another's property or domain without consent. Intrusion, whether physical or relational, is a form of coercion.

Liberty

The natural right to self-determination and personal sovereignty, including control over one's property. Liberty is considered violated when consent is overridden or force is imposed.

Moral Personhood

The status of being recognized as a free and responsible individual with inherent rights. Trespass infringes on moral personhood by denying rightful dominion.

Natural Rights

The foundational rights to life, liberty, and property, derived from natural law and not granted by government. Natural rights theory regards property as an extension of the self.

Nuisance

A legal term for conduct that interferes with another's enjoyment of their property. Nuisance may not involve entry but still violates the principle of rightful use.

Possession (Right of)

The control or occupancy of property. Possession is legally and morally protected, and violations of it constitute trespass or coercion.

Proportionality

A CPoR standard that limits the level of force used to match the severity of the threat. Deadly force may only be used to repel a deadly threat.

Property

In natural rights theory, property is not merely land or objects—it is a moral extension of the self, justified through labor, contract, or inheritance.

Reasonableness

The fifth CPoR standard. A defensive act must not only be sincere but also appear justified to an informed and impartial observer.

Scriptural Consent Theology

A moral and theological principle derived from Scripture that affirms God's pattern of relating to humanity through voluntary agreement rather than coercion. It teaches that moral authority—whether divine, personal, or civil—requires consent to be legitimate. From the covenantal invitations of the Old Testament to Jesus' invitation in Revelation 3:20, biblical ethics consistently uphold the sanctity of individual and collective consent. *Applied to civic life, scriptural consent theology holds that trespass, unlawful presence, or imposition of will without permission constitutes a moral violation, not merely a legal infraction.*

Self-Defense

The lawful act of using force to repel unlawful aggression. In the context of home invasion, self-defense is often justified when the violation is direct and threatening.

Sovereignty (Private)

The moral and legal concept that individuals have ruling authority over their own bodies, homes, and decisions. Trespass is a denial of private sovereignty.

Squatting

The occupation of land or buildings without permission or legal title. Even peaceful squatting is considered coercive under legal, ethical, and moral frameworks.

Jeff Pierson

Systemic Aggression

A pattern of repeated or tolerated violations (such as ongoing boundary intrusions) that collectively amount to a sustained denial of liberty and autonomy.

Trespass

The unlawful entry or refusal to leave another's property. Recognized in law as a tort and often a crime, trespass is treated as a form of coercion and moral aggression.

Violence (Non-Physical)

Any act that forcibly imposes will or presence without consent. Includes trespass, coercion, and violations of autonomy, even without physical harm.

Will (Imposition of)

The act of asserting one's choices over another's rights or authority. Imposing will without consent is a central element of ethical and moral aggression.

Copyright

© 2025 Jeff A. Pierson. All rights reserved.

This work and all related concepts under the *Concord Principle of Resistance* framework are the intellectual property of Jeff A. Pierson and are protected under U.S. and international copyright law. No part of this document may be copied, reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means—electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise—without prior written permission, except for brief quotations used in critical review, academic work, or educational settings with proper citation.

Jeff Pierson